

The Sun

WILLIAM M. LAFAN.

SATURDAY, MARCH 15, 1902.

Subscriptions by Mail, Postpaid.

DAILY, per Month, \$1.00
 DAILY, per Year, \$10.00
 SUNDAY, per Year, \$3.00
 DAILY AND SUNDAY, per Year, \$12.00
 DAILY AND SUNDAY, per Month, \$1.00
 Postage to foreign countries added.

Published by The Sun Newspaper Company,
 100 Nassau Street, New York City.

It is our friends who read us with manuscripts for publication who have rejected articles returned, they must in all cases send stamps for that purpose.

Mr. Bryan's New Single Issue.

It may not be true, as is now reported, that Col. BRYAN is advising Democratic leaders at Washington and elsewhere to concentrate their efforts upon a single campaign issue, namely, the election of Senators by popular vote.

Anyway, this is no recent idea of Col. BRYAN. In the spring of 1896, before his name and fame as a political philosopher had blossomed, he recorded his profound thoughts on the subject in the columns of the *Nebraska Literary Magazine*, then edited by Miss ESTHER SMYTER, with the assistance of Miss KATHERINE MELICK, Miss ANNA BROADY and others.

Mr. BRYAN wrote, six years ago, "for the consideration of those who are going forth from college prepared to give to society the advantage of their knowledge and mental discipline."

"The present method of electing United States Senators is not in harmony with our theory of popular government. Whatever may have been the reasons for its adoption, we have reached a time when the selection of United States Senators should be placed in the hands of the people. When this is done the electors will be able to choose the public servant whom they desire, and also to punish him if he betrays his trust. At present corporate influences are able to dictate the selection of Senators. The popular election of Senators, besides being more responsive to public sentiment, would do away with protracted deadlocks and leave the Legislature to deal with State matters."

At the same time Mr. BRYAN communicated to Miss SMYTER, Miss MELICK and Miss BROADY a number of other ideas on the reform of our political institutions and the revision of our Constitutional methods. Through the *Literary Magazine* he suggested the abolition of the President's veto power, the election of all Federal Judges by popular vote and limited terms instead of life tenure for the Supreme Court, and the establishment of the initiative and referendum.

Here are several more single issues, if the first one proposed by Mr. BRYAN doesn't suit.

A Scandalous Public Document.

Lack of delicacy, to use no harsher term, in dealing with the people's money is nowhere perhaps so prevalent as in the manufacture of public documents. Commissioners and scientific men who would never dream of putting a dollar of the State's cash into their own pockets will authorize the spending of thousands of dollars to print irrelevant papers and puerile "statistics" such as no private business would permit. A more reckless waste of public money than the "Fifth Annual Report of the Commissioners of Fisheries, Game and Forests of the State of New York," printed by the State Printer, we have rarely seen.

It is an ornament for any parlor table. A handsome, well-bound quarto volume of 466 pages, printed on calendered paper, full of colored plates and pictures, with an idyllic sporting scene in colors on its cover. Experts have been employed to paint the fishes and the birds here represented in chromolithographs; beautiful portraits of the Canadian red trout, the white perch, the black and striped bass, the blue fish, the Spanish mackerel, the canvasback duck, black and golden plover, the yellow legs and others, all in the colors of nature. There are numerous black and white pictures, many of them from photographs, as pretty pictures as may be seen in any magazine, though the scientific value of some may not be apparent. But why should the State of New York pay for all of this art?

Then there is the literary part of the report. Dr. JOHN GIFFORD describes, "Some European Forest Scenes," an interesting magazine article, which deals among other things with women reaping grain in Finland, and an oyster park near Archon, and the olive harvest. Mr. L. B. SPENCER tells what plants to use in a "balanced aquarium," whether of fresh or salt water. Dr. FERNOW gives a very full account of the Cornell School of Forestry and Dr. C. A. SCHENCK airs his views on "Forest Taxation." All interesting matter, which undoubtedly has a proper place somewhere; but why should the people of New York be made to pay for it?

Turning to the proper work of the commission, we come on a list of licenses issued, ranging from \$1 up, that fills thirty-two pages. It must have cost nearly as much to print as the smaller licenses brought in. So with the fines, the distribution of fish and the lists of forest fires. If it was necessary to print these at all in detail any business man managing his own affairs would have found a much cheaper way of doing so. The commission has thought fit to publish pages of specimen telegrams it has received and sent. Here are some of them:

"IDEAL LAKE, Aug. 23, 1899. No rain yet. Sun shines bright this morning. JAMES HICKS."
 "LAKE PLACANT, Aug. 20, 1899. Will start with me to-morrow. F. W. ABRAMS."
 "IDEAL LAKE, Sept. 20, 1899. Yek and a very good rain. OLIVER ST. MARTIN."
 "SARASAC LAKE, Sept. 21, 1899. It rained last night. Showers to-day. I. VORBERGER."
 "ALBANY, Sept. 20, 1899. I saw a yellow-bellied sapsucker. N. Y. ABRAMS."
 "SARASAC LAKE, N. Y. Have you had any rain, and how much?"
 "ALBANY, Sept. 21, 1899. Operator, did you get N. Y. Are you having any rain at your place?"

No doubt these telegrams were necessary at the time, but why in the world should they be printed or who would think of printing them if he had to pay

the cost himself? Why should the 60-cent fine of *SENeca-BROWN* et al., or that of *ADRIAL PATZ* be recorded in print on calendered paper? Why should a "State Fish Culturist's" pulverization of a person who disagrees with him be called a report on "Shad Culture in the Hudson River" and printed at the State's expense?

The report for the year 1898 went far beyond the legitimate bounds of such documents; that for 1899 is a long way ahead of its predecessor. The National Government's Entomological Bureau cannot hold a candle to it. It may make a pretty present from Legislators to their constituents, but it is a scandalous misuse of the money raised by taxation from the people of the State of New York.

The Hotel of 1828.

The United States Hotel in Fulton street is about to close, to be replaced by a big office building; so it was announced yesterday. There may be men alive now who can recall its opening in 1828, under the name of Holt's Hotel. That was an event of importance to this town, because the scale of magnificence on which the hotel was planned made it easily the palace of its day. Nothing like it in the hotel line had been constructed previously in New York, and it acquired the name of Holt's Folly.

New York was just recovering from the commercial depression of the War of 1812, and it was on the threshold of a great era of prosperity. Every industry was awakening to new life and vigor, and instead of "ships rotting in every creek and cove" as described by Dr. WATLAND, from morning till night there was activity in every shipyard. This period witnessed the real birth of New York's commercial greatness. With the completion of the Erie Canal, two years after the opening of Holt's Hotel, the supremacy of this port was established, and the city began to expand so rapidly that those who had ridiculed the work of the Commissioners appointed by the Legislature in 1807 to lay out the streets, because they plotted cross streets up to 155th street, began to think that perhaps the map then made might be useful after all.

The approach of incoming ships was flagged from Sandy Hook to Staten Island and then to Governors Island, and from there to the lofty cupola of Holt's Hotel, which towered high above the surrounding buildings. This advantage in getting ship news made this hotel the favorite resort for the officers of the London and Liverpool packets, of social as well as financial importance in those days. But such glory was short-lived. The very extravagance which advertised the hotel wrecked it. The manager failed, and his house was renamed the United States Hotel. Fulton street was left far behind in the upward growth of the city and in recent years very few New Yorkers have even known that such a hotel existed in this city.

Such a transformation as this in the span of a generous lifetime suggests the wonderful possibilities that the future has for New York. When the Commissioners of 1807 filed their map of New York's streets, less than a hundred years ago, they added a memorandum saying that it would probably be several hundred years before the country north of 155th street would be built up in city blocks. Even the widest stretch of the imagination could not foresee the rows of houses that now extend almost to Mount Vernon.

This is now a very big city, but it is bound to be much bigger.

The Judge, Overeating and the Workman's Lace Curtains.

Judge SIMON E. BALDWIN of Connecticut is an able lawyer and an accomplished citizen, but some survival of sour and middle-class Puritanism seems to be inside of him. At least we don't know to what else to impute the cause of a recent assertion of his that "the whole American nation is spending too much in eating and in furnishing the home." When the Judge has gone abroad strange countries for to see, he has been impressed with the frugality of many of the inhabitants. Perhaps he has seen ALPHONSE munching chestnuts, or CESARE making a meal of black bread and raw onion; and then he has been saddened to think of his countrymen with their porterhouse steaks, young pig with apple sauce and corn beef and cabbage. Why do the rascals eat so much and waste so much? Why don't they give up eating what they like, take the cheapest filling diet they can find and lay up more money? The Hon. EDWARD ATKINSON showed them years ago how to grow rich and rich by means of the dainties of the Aladdin oven, but a perverse generation refused the boon. Every week some wiseacre and officious friend of humanity tries to get people to put less into their mouths and more into their strongboxes. Why will Americans eat so much and of the best anyway, if they can get it?

Well, you can account for it by the democratic spirit, if you choose. What's not too good for thee is not too good for me. Equal privileges and equal opportunities of indigestion and everything else. Then the land is a land of plenty. Its paths drop fatness. A good living comes easily. In spite of the growing population, the taking up of most of the good land, the crowding of the trades and professions and the lessening interest of money, good eating and plenty of it is the rule. Doubtless the niceties of culinary science are too generally neglected and there is waste in many households. Doubtless the Americans of English and Irish descent are less saving as a class than those of German, Italian or French origin. But take the country through, the people live well; better, much better, than the people of any other country; and yet their savings in the savings banks, building associations, life insurance and most of all in the ownership of farm and homestead, are enormous. The American women are often unjustly attacked for extravagance and incompetence in the household. We believe that as a class they are as good managers and economists as the women of any other nation, and

they are certainly many diameters better looking.

Let folks live in their own way, so long as it is honest. Here is Judge BALDWIN worrying because he thinks that "lace curtains are too frequent in workmen's homes." Sure, here is the Puritan spirit again. The Judge doesn't have to pay for those lace curtains, and yet he is just as nervous as if he did. Why shouldn't workmen have lace curtains in their homes? Ought they to live in a barn so as to save a little more money? "Money is good," said the Persian poet, "and I am good to spend it." Why, lots of these rockless American workmen even let their wives and daughters play on the piano. They have pictures on their walls, and real carpets and rugs on their floors. Home is home, be it ever so handsome. How can a man spend his money better than on his home? There are millions of bright and cheerful homes in the United States, furnished better than Judge BALDWIN approves, but to the satisfaction of the inmates. That is the main point. Judge BALDWIN can object to lace curtains in his own home, if he wants to and if he thinks the objections will do any good; but really it is superfluous for him to be disturbed by the furnishings of the houses of other folks.

The American standard of comfort is high. Yet the people are not living beyond their means, or their aggregate savings would not have climbed to such high figures. They can afford roast beef and lace curtains.

Mr. Jerome's Surrender.

District Attorney JEROME's memorial to the two houses of the State Legislature increases the strangeness of the situation. He joins Mayor LOW in testifying practically that the Tammany management of the police leaves very little room for alteration by another Administration.

Sunday liquor selling, which, of all things forbidden in city life, is the commonest and most easily detected by the police, is, in Mr. JEROME's judgment, beyond the power of the law officers to restrict. The very fact that Mr. JEROME argues before the Legislature that no Administration of this city, politically prudent, will vary the system maintained by Tammany, and that he appeals to the Legislature to abolish the law without ever appealing to Mayor LOW to make an honest effort to enforce it, gives emphasis to his opinion that the municipal authorities are powerless in the matter, or had better seem so.

With this confession, however, the strongest argument for a change in the law fades away.

If the Mayor and the District Attorney of the city publicly announce that there is to be no effort to enforce the law, showing at the same time a smile of sympathy for its violation, the Legislature will be likely to occupy its time with subjects more pressing. The theory that the law as it stands is prolific of blackmailing can hardly be expected to outweigh the traditional public unwillingness to give to Sunday the aspect of being "open."

The Treasury and the Services.

In the course of passing upon claims submitted to it, the Accounting Division of the Treasury Department has assumed powers which make it in effect a branch of the law-making body and at the same time a court of final resort higher than even the Supreme Court of the United States. Hardly an issue of the service papers appears without recording some decision of an Auditor of the Treasury overruling a court judgment, or interpreting a law of Congress in a way apparently not in accord with the intent of that body, or noting a decree of the Court of Claims reversing such decisions. The matter affects civilians, of course, but it is of personal importance to officers of the military and naval services, as it often affects them directly in their pay and allowances.

The House Committee on War Claims made a report recently on a bill to authorize the readjustment of army officers' pay in certain cases, in which it declared:

"Notwithstanding express declarations of Congress, the accounting officers of the Treasury, in settling the accounts of army officers, have held: 1.—That an officer on the retired list is not entitled to longevity pay; 2.—That no officer is entitled to credit for services as a Volunteer officer in computing his longevity time; 3.—That no officer is entitled to credit for the time served as an enlisted man; 4.—That no officer is entitled to credit for his time as cadet at the Military Academy."

"These several rulings have been held to be erroneous by the Court of Claims and the Supreme Court."

"The matter is not new, but is constantly coming up in practice. Within a few weeks the Paymaster-General called the attention of Congress to the subject, and remarked: 'The officers of the Treasury have no more right to deny this pay to the claimants than any other money due them. It is certainly an arbitrary ruling maintained by force.'"

The navy suffers equally with the army by similar rulings of the Department. Only recently a case was decided by the Court of Claims which gave to an officer pay of which he had been mulcted by the Auditor of the Treasury seven years ago. This officer, attached to a vessel at sea, was wounded in the line of duty and sent to a hospital on shore; in spite of the navy regulations that he should receive sea pay while temporarily absent from his ship, the Treasury Department cut down his pay to shore-duty pay. Later the Comptroller of the Treasury decided that a case once closed could not be reopened, and the officer had to go to the Court of Claims for redress. Before the court, the Department admitted that the officer was attached to a sea-going vessel, but asserted the right to decide whether he was at sea or not.

The Court of Claims held that the status of a vessel determined the status of an officer attached to such a vessel, and awarded full sea pay to the officer. It will be remembered that the Secretary of War has refused to furnish to the other departments data from which they might decide military questions, on the ground that such questions were to be decided by his Department and the determinations accepted as official by the

other branches of the Government—a logical proceeding. The bill before the Committee on War Claims is general in its application, and should be enacted, in order that the Treasury Department may have its path of operations marked out, and that officers of the services may not be exposed continually to extra-legal decisions. It is not suggested that the Treasury makes its rulings with intentional injustice, but certainly many officers have suffered from them.

The selection of SAMUEL PARSONS, Jr., for landscape architect of the Park Department is an act worthy of great credit. Neither straight-out vandalism nor well-meaning ignorance will now be able to work its pleasure in the parks without a fight for it.

The decision of the Supreme Court against the Constitutionality of the Illinois Anti-Trust law because that law exempts from its operations agricultural products and live stock in the hands of the producer or raiser will give the philosophers of a number of Western and Southern States another chance to distinguish themselves. The favorite form of Anti-Trust law prohibits some trust and permits others. The merchants, the manufacturers, the railroads, the wicked commercial and industrial plutocrats must not enter into combination, but for the sake of coddling the "labor vote" and the "farmer vote," labor unions, the producers of agricultural products and the raisers of live stock may.

This was evident discrimination. Presumably the makers of the humbug acts in question knew that they were humbugging, but it was the fashion to be fierce against the trusts; and there are a great many farmers and laborers. Now the Supreme Court says that sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. The Legislature must try again. Can they make an honest effective law against trusts? Do they want to?

Perhaps DE LA REY's release of General LORD METHUEN was also an exhibition of Boer "slimeless." As a prisoner he was a burden. Returned to his own troops, if he were retained in command, he might again be a valuable source of new artillery supplies and a contributor, though an unwilling one, to further Boer successes in the field.

Representative BURKETT's bill, on which we commented yesterday, proposes to place on the retired list of the army certain persons who served in the Volunteer Corps of the United States in the war of the Rebellion, in the war with Spain, and in the Philippine insurrection, or for the same time in Cuba or Porto Rico; and names as fulfilling those requirements Col. ROBERT W. LEONARD, Majors JAMES E. SHELLENBERGER, JOHN R. PRIME, WILLIAM J. WHITE, MORRIS C. HUTCHINS, JAMES H. HYSBELL, SAMUEL O. L. POTTER, CHARLES S. BURNS, JOHN G. DAVIS, and JAMES G. SANDERS, Capt. REUBEN A. WHITE, HOLLAND G. PRINCE, FRANK D. NEW, Capt. JOHN P. GREENSTADT, JACOB H. CLYMER, HENRY A. FRED, DAVID F. ALLEN, RICHARD J. FANNING, ELIAS H. PARSONS, THOMAS DOWNS, EREN B. FENTON, HARLOW L. STREET and PHILIP MOTHERSILL; and Lieut. JAMES B. CLARE. We objected to the bill on the ground that some of the persons named, so far as the "Official Register of Officers of Volunteers" showed, did not meet the requirements proposed by the bill, namely: Maj. JOHN R. PRIME, who did not serve in the Spanish war; Capt. JACOB H. CLYMER and Capt. RICHARD J. FANNING, who did not serve in the Civil War. We further called attention to the fact that other officers, though fulfilling the letter of the requirements, had not left the United States during the Spanish war; Majors SHELLENBERGER and WHITE of the Third Ohio Volunteers, Capt. NEWBERRY of the Thirty-second Michigan, Capt. GREENSTADT of the Twenty-first Kansas, Capt. PRIME of the Fourth Missouri, Capt. ALLEN of the One Hundred and Fifty-eighth Indiana, and Lieut. CLARE of the Fifth Massachusetts. Because the officers named do not meet the requirements of the bill, or meet them only technically, we think the bill should not become a law as it stands.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: Will you explain under what rule of English law you "Amsterdam Bank stock is the property of the United States." I trust that the United States is not entitled to the pleasure of seeing the word "property" in print before J. March 13.

For a queer case, queer grammar, sometimes.

The most easily intelligible answer to the proposition for the popular election of Senators is Senator PENROSE's resolution to amend the Constitution so as to give the great States more Senators than the little ones. It was the inevitable answer.

The First Ministers in New York.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: Many of your readers within the last few days have no doubt been very much interested in the article which appeared in the *Evening Post* regarding the lives and passing away of many of the old-time ministers—the Christs, Bryants, Wests, Rices and others. If you will bear with me, I would be glad to give you an incident which occurred in the early days of ministry.

In or about the year 1848, the first company which appeared in this city was composed of four young men who appeared dressed as witty as himself. The tale runs that a barber of the name of Wright opened a small shop under the walls of the King's Bench Prison. The windows being broken, he inscribed the words, "Shave for a penny," with the usual invitation to customers to "step inside," while on his door he had written:

Shave as well as any man in England
 Almost, not quite.
 Poets have loved nothing so much as to see their own names in print, and so it was with the barber who was justly concluded to be a "character," pulled off his hat and suddenly shaking his head through the window pane into the shop, called out, "Is Jimmy Wright at home?"

Shave as well as any man in England
 Almost, not quite.
 Poets have loved nothing so much as to see their own names in print, and so it was with the barber who was justly concluded to be a "character," pulled off his hat and suddenly shaking his head through the window pane into the shop, called out, "Is Jimmy Wright at home?"

Shave as well as any man in England
 Almost, not quite.
 Poets have loved nothing so much as to see their own names in print, and so it was with the barber who was justly concluded to be a "character," pulled off his hat and suddenly shaking his head through the window pane into the shop, called out, "Is Jimmy Wright at home?"

Shave as well as any man in England
 Almost, not quite.
 Poets have loved nothing so much as to see their own names in print, and so it was with the barber who was justly concluded to be a "character," pulled off his hat and suddenly shaking his head through the window pane into the shop, called out, "Is Jimmy Wright at home?"

Shave as well as any man in England
 Almost, not quite.
 Poets have loved nothing so much as to see their own names in print, and so it was with the barber who was justly concluded to be a "character," pulled off his hat and suddenly shaking his head through the window pane into the shop, called out, "Is Jimmy Wright at home?"

Shave as well as any man in England
 Almost, not quite.
 Poets have loved nothing so much as to see their own names in print, and so it was with the barber who was justly concluded to be a "character," pulled off his hat and suddenly shaking his head through the window pane into the shop, called out, "Is Jimmy Wright at home?"

Shave as well as any man in England
 Almost, not quite.
 Poets have loved nothing so much as to see their own names in print, and so it was with the barber who was justly concluded to be a "character," pulled off his hat and suddenly shaking his head through the window pane into the shop, called out, "Is Jimmy Wright at home?"

LIBERIA'S NEW PRESIDENT.

The Good People of Monrovia Arise at 4 A. M. on Inauguration Day.

President Gibson of Liberia, was inaugurated at the capital, Monrovia, on Jan. 6. The people made a great day of it. The exercises, in fact, began before sunrise. In the eloquent language of a local newspaper:

"At 4 o'clock a signal gun licked out a tongue of flame and the entire populace, including the many visitors to the city, rose from their beds to meet the advancement."

It is presumed that the patriotic populace swallowed a rather hurried breakfast before sunrise for "at 6 o'clock another shot rang out, a muffled drum beat, a hurrying to and fro and the day was on." No eight-hour law places limitations upon inauguration day in Liberia. The job lasts about twenty hours.

The inaugural procession was soon formed. In the lead the many flags of the Executive Mansion stood a platform draped with United States and Liberian flags from which the President-elect was to deliver the inaugural address. It took some hours for the military to get in line and for the whole population to turn out in gala attire.

"The sun was now climbing high," writes the graphic reporter, "and the city was alive with gayly dressed ladies and gentlemen. The arm of the procession was with gold-laced buttons and shoulder plates."

"From the piazza of the Executive Mansion and from the many faces of the President's friends who had come to congratulate the distinguished statesman. The whole of the seven military companies had lined up in front of the mansion. Just before the procession started a slight diplomatic difficulty arose. There was a dispute over a question of precedence. The Legislature of Liberia felt that they had the right of their official dignity that they should march next to the President, but the American, Belgian, French, Dutch and Spanish consuls who represented the foreign Powers felt that their dignity would be affronted unless they marched next to the President."

The American Consul was the spokesman for the diplomatic body. He asserted that the Consuls not only represented the great Powers in the Republic of Liberia but also that they were to be regarded on this occasion as the special guests of the President-elect who, through them, honored the countries which had sent them there.

The Legislature also gave their views through their spokesman and the President-elect decided the matter. He directed that the Consuls, as his guests of honor, should have precedence over the local lawmakers.

The procession marched through the principal streets and back to the square where the oath of office was administered, and the President delivered his inaugural address. Then everybody repaired to the Executive Mansion.

"At the gateway of the public square," says the reporter, "stood a most beautiful scene. Four arches of artificial flowers were formed with beautifully dressed girls holding streamers of ribbon for the President and other distinguished gentlemen to pass under. At the doorway of the mansion stood a number of flower girls selected from the different countries."

When the President and his wife had been seated on a large sofa in the reception room the citizens of Liberia began to pay their respects, a ceremony that lasted some hours. Above the heads of the President and his wife "was a rainbow of flowers with a life-size mirror reflecting the grandeur of the occasion. Arched along the windows were crowns of flowers. The long snow-white curtains reaching far upon the pretty Brussels carpet showed up little for color an entertainment."

At 2:30 o'clock refreshments were served and at 4 o'clock the guests retired to prepare for the ball. As the reporter fully remarks, "it is customary to 'Nigritize' the ball, and the fireworks and Japanese lanterns threatened to make daylight again. Everywhere was a glow with bonfires, Roman candles and rockets. The room was filled to the doors with eager folk for the dance."

"Fair ladies and gallant gentlemen tripped the light fantastic toe till late. The city was soon served to liberal lagniappe from the fireworks corps, and Liberia sailed for another voyage for two more years of shifting sea life with its sunshine and storm, with its interior complications and external dangers."

AN UNEXPECTED HEIR.

Provision in a Will for One Newcomer, but Not for Twins.

From the Washington Times.
 The birth of twins, as claimants for part of an estate valued at nearly \$500,000, make a very serious problem which the Probate Court of the District has been called upon to solve.

The mother of the twins was twice married, and left three children by her first husband. She died, however, when the twins were about a month old. The three children by her first husband are also living.

By her will, made a few months before her death, the mother of the twins left her estate, consisting of real and personal property, to her children by her first husband. Provision was made, however, that in the event another child was born to her, she should be entitled to one-fourth interest in her personal estate, which is stated to be worth about \$100,000.

Now the question arises which of the twins will be entitled to the one-fourth interest in the personal estate, and what will be the share of the other. Or, again, will the one-fourth interest be divided equally between the twins, or will one be entitled to a one-fourth interest, as provided in the will, and the other to a one-eighth interest of the remaining three-fourths of the personal property. Then, again, is the event that it is a matter of some importance to the family, and it was appointed for the children by the first husband, and also for the twins.

Samuel Foote and the Barber.
 From the *Evening Evening News*.

Many an amusing story is told of eccentric wit, Samuel Foote, among others the following, in which the actor comes across a barber who was witty as himself. The tale runs that a barber of the name of Wright opened a small shop under the walls of the King's Bench Prison. The windows being broken, he inscribed the words, "Shave for a penny," with the usual invitation to customers to "step inside," while on his door he had written:

Shave as well as any man in England
 Almost, not quite.
 Poets have loved nothing so much as to see their own names in print, and so it was with the barber who was justly concluded to be a "character," pulled off his hat and suddenly shaking his head through the window pane into the shop, called out, "Is Jimmy Wright at home?"

Shave as well as any man in England
 Almost, not quite.
 Poets have loved nothing so much as to see their own names in print, and so it was with the barber who was justly concluded to be a "character," pulled off his hat and suddenly shaking his head through the window pane into the shop, called out, "Is Jimmy Wright at home?"

Shave as well as any man in England
 Almost, not quite.
 Poets have loved nothing so much as to see their own names in print, and so it was with the barber who was justly concluded to be a "character," pulled off his hat and suddenly shaking his head through the window pane into the shop, called out, "Is Jimmy Wright at home?"

HARD TIMES FOR A RODENT.

Efforts to Prevent the Great Destruction of the Chinchilla of the Chinchilla.

Chinchilla fur has been in unusually large demand for several years. As one of the leading sources of supply is Chile the country is beginning to think that unless restrictions are placed upon the trade the little animal will become extinct.

Perhaps many of the women who use chinchilla for collars, muffs and other purposes do not know that this little rodent is confined to South America where it dwells in colonies along the eastern slopes of the Andes from northern Peru to southern Chile, at elevations of from 8,000 to 12,000 feet above the sea.

Its little body, only ten inches long, is wrapped in soft, dense fur, gray above and dusky white beneath. It lives in the holes it burrows, coming out morning and evening to feed on roots and grass. Practically all the animals whose skins are sent to our markets are captured by Indians with the aid of trained weasels.

Prof. Federico Albert of the Santiago University has just written an article in which he says that the demands of European and American furriers have increased so much that the exports grew from 184,548 skins in 1896 to 892,328 in 1898, and 364,548 in 1899, while in 1900 the exports were 695,000 skins, valued at 2,000,000 piasters.

The Scientific Society of Chile has now appealed to the Legislature to restrict the enormous slaughter of this beautiful animal.

"The Journal *La Nature* of France thinks that measures of restriction, however, will not be necessary. It says that chinchilla has been in fashion for five or six years and in all probability, therefore, the demand will soon decrease and the hunt for the animals will become less active. There are few fur animals that are steadily in fashion, and the chinchilla is not one of them."

When the great demand for some particular fur subsides the poor animal has a respite and may regain their former numbers, while some other fur animal that has taken its place in popularity is mercilessly pursued.

CANADA.

Provinces and Subsidies.—A. BOURASSA on Independence and Annexation.

MONTREAL, March 12.—The Quebec Provincial Legislature, as I stated in my last communication, would be the only last taken upon the question of the increase of the subsidy paid annually by the Federal Government to each province of the Dominion toward the cost of its administration. The matter of recent decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the case of a former against the Canadian Pacific Railway in favor of the railway company is also under discussion, and with it other questions of a good deal of importance. The intention appears to be to press both questions to an issue, the first having also been taken up, since I last wrote, by the New Brunswick Legislature.

The principal point in the subsidy discussion is that whereas, when the proportion of the revenue to be paid to the provinces was fixed, the revenue of Canada out of which it was taken was only \$18,716,786; the figure is now \$35,177,000. The demand is for such an augmentation of the subsidy from the Dominion treasury as will enable the provinces to meet the increased cost of administration coincident with the progress of the country, but especially because of the needs of education in the Province of Quebec whose population, owing to the system of instruction pursued, the want of proper school accommodation in the rural districts, and the mismanagement of the schools, is behind that of all the other provinces in ordinary, technical and scientific education. When the decision of the Legislature of Quebec and New Brunswick on the subsidy question and as to the terms of the resolutions embodying it have been taken, they will be formally conveyed to the Government at Ottawa with a request that it amend the British North America Act of 1867 in conformity with them. This raises the whole question of the relations of the provinces, of the Dominion and the Imperial Government.

The other subject of most political interest at the moment is the appearance of the long-announced brochure by the well-known French-Canadian member of the Dominion Parliament, Mr. H. BOURASSA, entitled "Great Britain and Canada." Imperialism and the Boer war furnish the text of an elaborate and carefully written treatise on the new situation created for Canada by her participation in the war, the influence exercised at Ottawa by the military and naval authorities, and the pressure put on the Government by the Colonial Office in London through the British Government of the Canadian Empire, backed by the Governor General, Lord Minto.

After a very able and concise discussion of these matters and their collateral issues, Mr. BOURASSA discusses the questions of independence and annexation. He admits that the reaction which he foresees must follow the present policy of the British Government in regard to the Canadian provinces of French origin, and says it is the solution that would be most acceptable to the Canadians of French origin. He fears, however, that the reaction will be in the direction of a section of Anglo-Canadians has created will prevent harmony in independence, and that the ultimate solution will be in the direction of the Canadian provinces as States in the "Great American whole," as he calls it. But he says: